

leader, and that resolves around the rescission bill itself. The gentleman mentioned that two bills will be considered in the Rules Committee and brought to the floor. Does the gentleman expect these rules to be considered separately?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, as I pointed out, the Rules Committee has not yet met and decided that.

Mr. BONIOR. May I inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee whether his intention is to consider these bills separately or together?

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield, as the distinguished majority leader has said, the Rules Committee has not met, but I will say to the gentleman that there is a probability that we will.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me just mention to my friends, one bill is an emergency bill and one is a nonemergency bill, and as the gentleman will recall vividly from his objections last year, the rules were changed to make it contrary to the new House rules to have these bills considered together and combined. So I hope we will stay with the rules and standards which you established for us during the last Congress and have implemented in the rules of this Congress.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield finally to any friend, the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Majority Leader, if I could engage you for a moment, I want to point out to the majority leader that last week you and I had a colloquy. The gentleman observed that it was in our best interest to put me at home with my family as opposed to having me on the floor, and you know we agree on that, and I want to thank the gentleman.

I was speaking with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] as we went off the floor and I said see, just 1 week later and we have 3 days that we will be able to be with our families, so we thank the gentleman for that.

I would note, with my tongue just a little bit in my cheek, that this may bring out something that we have been trying to say all along, that when you remove items of the contract from consideration, like the term limits bill, that not bringing something up under the contract might truly be construed as family friendly.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I would just like to take up one other little matter with the floor leader, and just bring it to his attention, and I hope that in the future maybe we can work out a little bit better utilization of time than we have been.

This morning we had a limit of 10 1-minutes on each side. At the time we had a number, quite a few more here that wanted to make 1-minutes, including yours truly, and I do not know,

there were other Members of your party here also, but I do not know how many wanted to do 1-minutes. I did not go ask them.

□ 1300

But we are here now at 1 o'clock and everything, and I would hope that in the future Members would be able to give them. I appreciate it if the majority leader would recognize that this is an opportunity that many Members think is very worthwhile, to express themselves on an issue, and that by reducing that time unnecessarily it appears to some of us that you just do not want to hear us on the floor of the House, and I hope that that is not so. I would hope that, come like Monday, and Tuesday, there should not be any limit at all; come Wednesday, that we could have sufficient—at least 15 on each side, and then Thursday we will leave it up to you because you want to get out, and we all want to get out at 3 o'clock. But I would hope that we can have a little more favorable view of these 1-minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I would say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] that I would look forward to listening to him speak for as long as he wants. I am sure he could have a 1-hour prime time special order on Monday, and, if the gentleman takes that special order, I am sure I will find some time to listen to some part of it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, I am not looking for the 1 hour for myself. I am looking for other Members that have been over here that have speeches ready to go and cannot give them because we have an artificial barrier of limiting the 1-minutes when some feel that it really is not necessary to limit it on certain days, and I would hope that the floor leader—I am not asking for an answer right now, but I hope he looks at it for the future and tries to assess it a little bit different.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we plan for a 3 o'clock departure for today. We had a couple of amendments withdrawn. We had a couple of others that were accepted, and we got a bonus because of the working relationship of the majority and minority Members on the floor, and, yes, it turns out, given that circumstance, that our need was not as we had thought it was, and I thank the gentleman for his point.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish the majority leader a very pleasant and happy weekend.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKER). The Chair would point out that additional 1-minute speeches are in order at this time.

—
 HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY,
 MARCH 14, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 13, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m., on Tuesday, March 14, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

—
 ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY,
 MARCH 10, 1995, TO MONDAY,
 MARCH 13, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

—
 DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
 WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
 WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

—
 PROVIDING FOR THE TRANSFER
 OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEE POSI-
 TIONS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 113) providing for the transfer of certain employee positions and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 113

Resolved, That (a)(1) the two statutory positions specified in paragraph (2) are transferred from the House Republican Conference to the majority leader.

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the position established by section 102(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1988, as contained in section 101(i) of Public Law 100-202; and

(B) the position established by section 102(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1990.

(b)(1) The two statutory positions specified in paragraph (2) are transferred from the majority leader to the House Republican Conference.

(2) The positions referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the position established for the chief deputy majority whip by subsection (a) of the first section of House Resolution 393, Ninety-fifth Congress, agreed to March 31, 1977, as enacted into permanent law by section 115 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1978 (2 U.S.C. 74a-3); and